BELLARMINUS JUNIOR

ENERVATUS:

OR THE

INSUFFICIENCY

OF

Mr. *Richard Baxters* Answer

TO

Dr. *Owen's* Twelve Arguments

ABOUT

Divine Worship

DETECTED.

Wherein is given an exact Parallel between the Distinctions and Answers *Bellarmine* and other Papists use against Protestants about Worship, and Mr. *Baxters* Distinctions and Answers to Dr. *Owen's* Arguments.

Chore & Dathan & Abiron, qui sibi contra Moysen & Aaron Sacerdotem Sacrificandi Licentiam *vindicare conati sunt, pœnas statim pro suis conatibus pependerunt.*

——*Et filii Aaron, qui imposuerunt Altari ignem* Alienum, *quem non præceperat Dominus: in conspectu statim Domini vindicantis extincti sunt.* Quos imitantur *scilicet, atq; sectari, qui Dei Traditione contempta alienas Doctrinas appetunt, &* Magisteria humanæ Institutionis *inducunt, quos increpat Dominus & objurgat in Evangelio suo dicens, Rejicitis mandatum Dei, ut traditionem vestram statuatis. Pejus hoc crimen est, quam quod admisisse lapsi videntur.* Cyprian de Unitate Eccles. Tom. 2.

Printed in the Year 1684.

To the READER.

Reader,

LEt not the Title given the enſuing Papers diſpleaſe thee, for 'tis but adjuſted to the Subject matter of the Authors diſcourſe, and doth not in the leaſt wrong his Learned Adverſary.

Mr. Baxter *has moſt undoubtedly cloſed with* Bellarmine *and other* Papiſts *in the very Diſtinctions and Anſwers they uſe againſt Proteſtants about Worſhip, and in his late Writings has done the Jeſuites work, and if he will be found in their Work, can he have any juſt Reaſon to be angry with thoſe that give him 'their Name? What hurt can there be in giving* Bellarmine's *Name to him that eſpouſes* Bellarmine's *Doctrine, and doth* Bellarmine's *Work? If the paralel then in the following Papers be exact (as I am very confident it is) the Title needs not an Apology. And as for the diſcourſe it ſelf, do but diligently peruſe it, and be but Impartial and Sincere in thy Cenſure, and the Author is content to ſubmit unto it.*

But Reader, *I muſt beg thy pardon, if I detain thee a few Minutes by a ſhort* Preface, *which is chiefly deſigned to ſhew thee the Confuſion our* Nonconforming-Clergy *have plunged themſelves into by their undertaking the Defence of* Lay-Conformity.

There are two Men of Name, and I think but two, who have entred the Field, and bid Defiance to their Suffering Brethren, even ſome Months after a more potent Arm had driven them by fifties into their Caves, out of which, leaſt ſome worſe evils ſhould befall them, they durſt not peep, ſo that the Prudence of theſe Worthies, [viz. their falling on a People (who they knew) durſt not defend themſelves] deſerves Applauſe. But yet ſuch is the Power *of Truth, ſuch the Confuſion in which Error lies, that (bleſſed be God) there is no great need for the* Lay-Diſſenters *to ſay much in their own behalf. Somewhat*

 muſt

must be said, but not much; for if we do but shew how much these great Men do clash with each another, and the greatest of them with himself; and how both, though diversly, have abandoned some Principal Points *of the* Protestant Religion, *and are gone over to the* Papists *for help against us; a further Answer can be of use to none, but such as are very ignorant of the* Protestant Religion.

The great men I speak of, are Mr. Baxter *and* Mr. Humphrey, *both very Learned Divines, the one known to the World by his Voluminous and hasty Writings, the other, though not so sagacious and metaphysical, yet I think more considerate and judicious. Both very* Pious, *and I question not, but that tho* Mr. B. *be the greater Preacher, yet* Mr. H. *is the more plain hearted Man, and of as tender a Conscience. They are both too great to mind the* Garniture *of their Writings more than the* Substance *of a Notion, and for many things they have written, they deserve great praises, yet these two* Worthies *most unhappily have appeared against their Suffering Brethren, by which I see that an Argument suited only to the Brutal* Part *of Man has too great an Influence on Good and Wise Divines.* Conscience, *though a tender thing, yet is found even amongst some Learned and* Pious Men *to be too much under the Conduct of* Sence. *The fear of suffering, and some such uneasie Inconveniences, warps strong minds towards a Closure with* Peters *Doctrine, when he said* [Be it far from thee Lord, this shall not be unto thee.]

For indeed those very affections that lead Men into divers Errors, do first carry the Man into the dark, and both bribe and blind his Judgement, the which is very often fully discovered by the confusion, the Inconsistences, the Thwartings and Contradictions that are in their Writings. Of the Truth hereof no greater Instance can be desired than what these two great Men do supply us with, who, though both engaged in opposing the Lay-Dissenter, *as I have already observed, and will now evince, do clash with one another, both abandon some chief points of the Protestant Doctrine, and* Mr. B. *falls out with himself.*

Mr. H.

Mr. H. *ingeniously confesseth, that the Notion he fixes in the opposition he makes against his Dissenting Brethren is* uncommon *amongst Protestants.*

See his Axe laid to the Root of Separation *pag.* 33. *and you'l have his Sentiments in these very words,* 'I do not see '(*saith he*) *in the first place but we must give up the Cause of our* 'mixt Churches (Parochial *or* National) *to the Separatist. They* 'who require *such a profession in the* Adult, (viz. *a profession* 'of *saving Faith, as the Church of* England *and all* Pro- 'testants *generally do*) *as necessary to give Right to Church* 'Communion, *and do indeed understand themselves, will say, It* 'must *be a profession* de præsenti, *serious, intelligent, resolved,* 'with *whatsoever else is needful to make it credibly significant* 'of *the thing they profess, so that the* Person *professing must* 'be *indeed* Regenerate *to be able to make it, and the* Persons 'that *receive him must look on him as* Regenerate, *and what* 'more *can be imagined for the yielding to the Congregationalists* 'his *whole Foundations. So far* Mr. H. *who really speaks very uprightly, and as an unbyast man sees, that those he calls* Separatists *have Arguments impregnable for the Defence of their present withdrawment from the mixed* Parochial *Assemblies, if the Doctrine of the Church of* England *and that commonly received by* Protestants *be sound. And he sees no way to drive the Lay-Dissenters from one Foundation of their dissent, but by going over to a Notion, which,* Mr. B. *saith is a* Popish *one.*

The Principle *on which the Lay-Dissenters ground their practice is, as* M. H. *confesseth, a* Protestant Principle; *and such as has been defended by* Mr. B. *against the* Papists Mr. Blake *and* Mr. H. *This much may be seen in* Mr. B's. *Right to Sacraments, where he assures us that the chief Adversaries he has in this very point to deal with, are the* Papists, *and adds* p. 51. 'That *he is* 'forcee *to deal with a Reverend Brother of our own, and in* p. 442 'That *thongh it be the defence of the old* Protestant *Cause that* 'is *finally his business, yet it is the late opposition made against it* 'by *two* Protestant *Divines, that is the occasion of his under-*

taking, to wit, Mr. Blake, *and ſince him* Mr. Humphrey. *Thus you ſee* Mr. Humphrey *is in* Mr. Baxter's *Judgement gone over to* Rome *for help againſt Diſſenters, and* Mr. H. *is ſo generous as to confeſs there is no other way to confute us.*

But as Mr. B. *and this worthy Divine claſh, ſo doth* Mr. B. *in one great point fall out with himſelf, and in another falls in with the* Papiſts. *About the kinds of Inſtituted Churches* Miniſtry *and* Diſcipline, *which* Mr. B. *after* 30 *or* 40 *years hard ſtudy had invincibly prov'd to be Congregational,* Mr. B. *finds it neceſſary to quarrel with himſelf, if he will maintain his Cauſe againſt the Lay Diſſenter. And what is wonderful, this Learned Man has tugg'd hard to find out ſome* ſelf-reconciling-Diſtinctions, *but now (though never till now) is ſo very much nonpluſt, that his greateſt Admirers are compell'd to ſay the good Man is too hard for himſelf. Though he ever was (at leaſt in their opinion) the Champion that kept the Field, yet now he hath driven himſelf out of it. And as to the Controverſie about Ceremonies, the* Reader *will find in the following Sheets he has abandoned the old Proteſtant Principles, and is gone over to* Rome *for help againſt his Nonconforming Brethren.*

This much Reader, *I thought fit to acquaint thee with, that thou mighteſt ſee how the Diſſenters caſe lies. There are three Foundations on which they ground the Reaſons of their refuſing to communicate with the Pariſh Aſſemblies.* 1. *Some Diſſenters cannot communicate with the Pariſh Aſſemblies, becauſe the Pariſhioners are not* fit matter *for Church Communion. Their Ignorance and Scandalous Converſations ſhew that they have no right to Sacraments. The profeſſion of their Faith being ſhort of what is ſaving, they cannot be juſtly eſteemed* fit matter *for a particular Inſtituted Church of Chriſt, and wanting fit matter, they want an* Eſſential, *and are not, cannot be a Church, nor can any Chriſtian have any* Church Communion *with them any more than with a Company of* Jews *or other Infidels. Now that their Reaſonings on this* Topick *are according to the Proteſtants Doctrine Invincible,* Mr. H. *doth vehemently averr.*

2. *Other*

2. *Other Diſſenters cannot communicate with the* Pariſh *Churches, becauſe they are of a* Species, *deſtructive of Chriſts inſtituted Church Form, Miniſtry and Diſcipline. That the preſent Dioceſan kind of Churches is inconſiſtent with, and deſtructive of the* Presbyterian *and* Congregational *kinds of Churches, we appeal to the Church of* England *her ſelf. And that therefore the Dioceſan Churches are deſtructive of Chriſts inſtituted Churches, is the burden of all* Mr. B. *writings, and therefore not to be communicated with as ſuch.*

3. *Other Diſſenters ſay, that if the* Pariſhes *had been both for* matter *and* form *ſound Churches, yet ſo long as they impoſe any ſinful Terms of* Communion, *a Separation is juſtificable. But according to the Notion* Mr. B. *has of the impoſed Ceremonies in conjunction with another, held by all* Proteſtants *generally, whether* Lutheran, *or* Calviniſt *abroad;* Conformiſt, *or* Nonconformiſt *at home; the controverted Ceremonies are violations of the ſecond Commandment, and* Idolatrous. *For* Mr. B. *makes them parts of external Worſhip, and all acknowledge that they are not particularly Inſtituted, and therefore according to* Proteſtant *Principles, they are Idolatrous, and not to be ſubmitted unto.*

This is the true Diſſenters caſe, and Dr. Owen *in his Arguing againſt Lay-Conformity, ſuppoſing the Perſons with whom he had to deal, were ſatisfied in the matter and Form of Inſtituted Churches, and neceſſity there is of adhering unto Divine Inſtitutions in the Adminiſtration of Ordinances, doth in his Premiſes take it for granted that the kind of the preſent Dioceſan Churches is oppoſite unto the Congregational, and that taking in the whole Syſteme of thet Liturgy-worſhip with all its inſeparable dependances, 'was not lawful to Communicate with the Church of* England *in it, for that the Worſhip it ſelf is not Lawful. And who knoweth not, that 'tis undoubted Duty to forbear Communion with any in what is unlawful.*

To prove the Worſhip it ſelf unlawful, the Dr. urged ſeveral Arguments, which being brought to Mr. B. *with the addition of*

Unan-

Unanſwerable, *which the Good Man could not but think himſelf above all others obliged to the Indecence of publiſhing them with this pretended Confutation.*

I will not enquire after what moved Mr. B. *an old grave Divine, who hath been a Man of war all his days, and now as himſelf, tells us, every day expecting his change, and to be where there is more* Light, Life, *and* Love, *ſhould ſpend his precious minutes in reproaching the Dead, and in adding unto the ſorrows and ſufferings of the living, by troubling the World with a Popiſh Anſwer to old Proteſtant Arguments about Divine Worſhip, it ſhall ſatisfie me to ſhew the* Reader, *that the* Author *of the following Sheets has not abus'd* Mr. B. *in the paralel he gives between him and the Papiſts, and that the ſtrength of* Mr. B's. *Anſwer to* Dr. O's *arguments lean on ſome Popiſh Diſtinctions.*

I ſay that Mr. B. *did take 'em out of* Bellarmine, *and other Jeſuits, for ſomewhat of this kind has been long ago done by* Morton *and* Burgeſs *in their Controverſie with the old Nonconformiſts, and afterward by* Mr. Ball *a Nonconformiſt whom it may be* Mr. B. *ſtole 'em, for, If I miſtake not, in* Ball *you'l find a great deal of* Mr. B's. *Anſwer to the* Dr. *and whoever will conſult* Cotton, Alling, *and* Shephard *of* New-England *againſt* Ball, *may ſee enough to anſwer* Mr. Baxter.

But what way ſoever Mr. B. *came by all theſe Diſtinctions, I am ſure they are Jeſuite, for on an Impartial enquiry I find the Author very juſt in his procedure. And as for my own part, I do think that the Church of* England *is no way owing unto* Mr. B. *for his late Scribbles againſt the Lay-Diſſenter, for, if I may ſpeak out, the Papiſts only, Not the Church of* England *has cauſe to thank him for what he has done.*

Ti's notorious that Mr. B. *makes almoſt every decent Circumſtance of Worſhip expreſſive of the Reverence of the Heart to God parts of external worſhip, and ſo turns naked, or meer Circumſtances into ſignificant Ceremonies, and by his Jeſuit diſtinctions attempts their defence. But the Church of* England *doth not ſo; She diſtinguiſheth between* Ceremonies, *and the*

De-

Decent Circumſtances *of Worſhip, even Dr.* Sherlock *himſelf (as well as* Bp. Taylor, *and the moſt Judicious Sons of the Church) ſaith, that thoſe* Men *miſtake the caſe of the Church of* England, *who lay the controverſie upon Rituals and Ceremonies, for there is no ſuch thing in the Church of* England, *according to the true and proper Signification of the Words. See* Sherlocks *anſwer to the* Proteſtant Reconciler.

The Controverſie between the Church of England *and Diſſenters lies here, Whether the* Church of England uſes in her Worſhip, any uninſtituted Ceremonies? *If it can be proved that ſhe uſes any uninſtituted Ceremonies, the debate is at an end.* Prove *this, and the Church of* England *will grant ſhe is on the erring ſide; for they all affirm that the Law of* Moſes *conſiſted of a great many* Significant Rites, *and* Ceremonies, *ſuch as* Circumcision, Waſhings, Purifications, *&c. many of which was inſtituted purely for the Signification but then the deſign of it was to teach them by ſuch External Rites thoſe things, which at that time he did not think fit to make a plain and clear Revelation of —— But to transform the plain 'Precepts and Revelations of the Goſpel into Earthly Figures, 'is to teach* Men *backwards, to draw them off from the im- 'mediate Contemplation of Pure and Naked Truths, to court a 'Picture and a Shadow, and to dote upon Earthly Figures and I- 'mages of it. —— Such Significant Ceremonies as are meerly 'for Signification, in the Chriſtian Religion do only* obſcure, 'and debaſe. *Divine Myſteries are wholly uſeleſs, when we are 'inſtructed in thoſe things by plain and expreſs Revelations, 'which theſe Ceremonies teach, or rather darken by Earthly 'Figures; and they corrupt a* Spiritual *Worſhip, which hereby 'degenerates into external Pomp and Show. —— Such mean 'Repreſentations, as theſe, are only for the entertainment of 'Children, &c. This much you have in* Sherlock ubi Supra p. 56.

In a word then, the buſineſs of the Nonconformiſts with the Church of England *is not to prove uninſtituted Ceremonies unlawful, but to prove the matters Controverted to be more than*

meer

meer decent circumſtnces of Worſhip, to be ſuch Ceremonies *as are unſuited to the Goſpel Diſpenſations, the which being ſo, a* Man *of a common Capacity may with half an eye ſee how wide* Mr. B. *and his Followers are from the true State of the Controverſie, when they grant the things under debate to be ſignificant Ceremonies, expreſſive of the Reverence of the Heart to God, and parts of External Worſhip, not particularly inſtituted, and yet think to plead for the Church of* England; *whilſt indeed they only gratifie the Papiſts, in aſſerting the Church to have a Power to add unto the worſhip of God.* Bellarminus Senior *himſelf, had he been alive, could not do the Church of* Rome *greater Service than our* Bellarminus Junior *in this particular has done. And a greater ſtep towards Popery cannot in this unhappy Juncture be made.*

I am ſure that how much ſoever Sherlock *may give the* Romaniſts *in making the Catholick Church viſible to be but one Corporation, one Body Politick or governed Society,* Mr. B *has gone beyond him in matters of* Ceremony. *And I am confident that the giving a Fair and Impartial State of theſe things wherein the Author has done the Church of* England *Right in acquainting the* Reader, *how far ſhe doth in* Theſi *differ from the Church of* Rome, *and in confeſſing how far* Mr. B. *and his Adorers have in this point to our inexpreſſible ſhame forſaken* Proteſtant Truths, *and fallen in with the Jeſuite, is not a tranſgreſſion of our Laws, for which Reaſon might the* Author *expect as fair quarter from* Mr. Baxter *as the Church of* England *(I preſume) will give him, he might very ſafely appear above board. But who is ſo bold as to expoſe his Perſon to the laſh of* Mr. Baxters Invectives.

Farewel.

BELLARMINUS JUNIOR ENERVATUS.

The Introduction.

IT's marvellous to ſee how many Wiſe, how many Learned, how many Rich and Wealthy Diſſenters do run to the name of Mr. *B. tanquam ad aſylum*, for the defence of their late *Lay-conformity*, as if the very mention of Mr. *Baxters* Judgement and Practice had been an invincible Argument for their communicating with the preſent Pariſh Aſſemblies, as by Law required.

If we diſcourſe the moſt conſiderate and thinking Men among them, whether Miniſters or People, they'l, for the moſt part, refer us to Mr. *Baxter*, and his late Writings; ſo that for ought I can ſee to the contrary, the ſhewing on what a weak Reed, all thoſe, who do inſiſt ſo very much on Mr. *Baxters Authority*, do lean, will be a ſufficient anſwer to all that they have ſaid *for* their *own*, and *againſt* the practice of their Diſſenting Brethren.

For this Reaſon, the *Author* of that little Treatiſe entituled [*Mr Baxters Judgement and Reaſons againſt communicating with Pariſh Aſſemblies; and the defence of that Judgement*] has, I 'count, taken a moſt effectual method to confound and ſilence both Mr. *Baxter* and all his admirers; for he has ſhewn, that Mr. *Baxter*, to the end he

might ſay ſomewhat in favour of the *Communion* in controverſy, has abandoned his old Principles touching the *Species*, or *Kind* of the Dioceſane Churches Miniſtry and Diſcipline; but yet ſo, that what was the off-ſpring of Mr. *Baxters* hardeſt Studies for thirty or forty years together, when his parts were in their greateſt *Strength* and *Vigour*, is ſo ordered by that *Author*, as to remain an unanſwerable Confutation of all he has ſaid now on a ſuddain, in defence of his own, and his followers preſent conformity.

In purſuance of the ſame deſign, as that *Author* has with greateſt clearneſs evinc'd Mr. *Baxter* to be a *ſelf-Confuter* in the preſent controverſy, differing as much from himſelf as 'tis poſſible for one Man to differ from another. I will in theſe papers endeavour to ſhew, *That he has*, in matters relating to the *Worſhip* of *God*, *forſaken the Principles of all ſound Proteſtants*, whether *Forreign* or *Domeſtick*: Yea, I will ſhew, that he has not only *exploded* the *Principles* of the old Nonconformiſts, whom he pretends to Revere and honour, but has alſo relinquiſhed the *avowed Doctrine* of the *Church of England*, and is gone over unto the *Roman Tents* for help againſt his ſuffering Diſſenting Brethren in his anſwer to Dr. *Owen*.

I'le not engage in the Controverſy about the *Lawfulneſs* or *Unlawfulneſs* of Communicating with Pariſh Churches, as by law required. To do ſo is not ſafe. But the thing I undertake is but to make it manifeſt. That to *Conforme* on the Principles and Reaſons Mr. *Baxter* layes down in Anſwer to Mr. *Ralphſon* and Dr *Owen*, is to *abandon the Proteſtant Doctrines* in theſe Particulars, and fall in with the *Papiſts*, and that therefore the preſent Lay Conformity, on Mr. *Baxters Grounds* and *Reaſons*, cannot be good, if the Proteſtant Religion embrac'd by all the Reformed, and even by the Church of *England*, be true and ſound.

The

The Method I take ſhall be plain and eaſie, for I will firſt ſhew how Mr. *Baxter* agrees with the Papiſts, and differs from all ſound Proteſtants about *Worſhip* and *Ceremonies*, and then give a true ſtate of the Controverſy, and lay down thoſe *Arguments* that are urged by Proteſtants againſt the Papiſts, and the *Anſwers* given by the Papiſts, and ſhew that in ſeveral inſtances Mr. *Baxter agrees* with the *Papiſts*, and *differs* from all ſound *Proteſtants*.

Reader, I would have thee to obſerve that in doing this I ſhall make it very manifeſt, that the ſtrength of Mr. *Baxters* Anſwers to Dr. *Owen* lies on ſome rotten exploded Diſtinctions and Cavils of the Papiſts, and that whoever clearly underſtands the Writings of the Old Reformed Divines cannot but ſee that Mr. *Baxter* has ſaid nothing againſt Dr. *Owen*, but what has been fully anſwered by our Champions, who with much triumph have driven the Popiſh Janizaries out of the field.

SECT. I.

Mr. Baxter *agrees with* Papiſts, *and differs from all ſound* Proteſtants *about* Worſhip *and* Ceremonies.

§ 1. ALl agree that Divine External Worſhip is the direct or immediate expreſſion of the Reverence and Honour of the Heart to God. But then

§. 2. The Proteſtants do affirm, that there is a difference between Divine *External* Worſhip, and thoſe *Circumſtances*, that are neceſſary to the performance of Worſhip. The Circumſtances of *Time*, *Place*, *Geſture*, *Veſture*, &c. Which fall not under a Divine Inſtitution, but belong to Religious Actions as they are *natural*, and ſo

common both to Religious and Civil Acts, are only for External Order and Comelineſs, and reſpect Men only, and are not expreſſions of the Reverence of the heart to God. Thus Bp. *Abbot* in his *Defence of Mr. Perkins againſt Mr. Biſhop* a Papiſt. p. 844. Order and Comelineſs properly and immediately reſpect Men, and therefore can be no parts of the Worſhip of God. And ſo *Biſhop Taylor* in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, They are only External Circumſtances for Order and Comelineſs, not parts of Worſhip.

§. 3. The Papiſts do cloath theſe Circumſtances with a Ceremonious nature, and make them parts of Worſhip. So Mr. *Biſhop*. *Order* and *Comelineſs in ſome part of Gods Worſhip*. So *Bellarmine de effectu Sacramentorum*. lib. 2. c. 31. produces ſeveral arguments to prove, that the *Ceremonies* are *parts of Worſhip*, and indeed a great part of the Popiſh Religion lies in making what is a neceſſary Appendage to the Natural Act in Worſhip, a part of Worſhip. E. gr. It's neceſſary that the Prieſt in the Exerciſe of Publique Worſhip, be cloathed, and that the Worſhip be in ſome *place*, that the Water in Baptiſm, and the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper be in ſome *Veſſel*, now the Papiſts make the very Cloathing of the Prieſt, the Buildings and Adornings of their Temples, the Fonts for Baptiſme, the Veſſels for the Elements in the Lord's Supper to be moſt Rich and Sumptuous, that they may thereby the more fully expreſs the Reverence of the Heart unto God, and ſo are all parts of their Worſhip. A great deal of their Religion conſiſts in an orderly Obſerving of theſe things.

§. 4. Here then lies a difference between Mr. *Baxter* and Proteſtants, But an exact agreement between him and the *Papiſts*.

Who-

Whoever will be at the pains of conſulting Mr. *Baxters* Anſwers unto Mr. *Ralphſon*, and Dr. *Owen*, he will find one principal part of his ſtrength to lie here, namely, in making theſe very Circumſtances, parts of Worſhip. In his Anſwer to Dr. *Owen*, he refers us to what he ſaith againſt Mr. *Ralphſon*, where he tels us. 'That there are 'two ſorts of Worſhip, a Firſt and Second: And that the '*Secondary* Worſhip (which he calls ſubordinate) is a di-'rect or immediate expreſſion of the Reverence of the 'Heart to God. The inſtances of which are many, not 'only undetermined *Geſtures* in publique Worſhip, but the '*Place* of publique Worſhip, of which he ſaith, if great 'and lofty Structures, called *Temples*, be built purely to ſhew 'how we honour God and Religion, as *Conſtantine*, and o-'thers after him, did at *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Jeru-'ſalem*, over the grave of Chriſt, and all over the Empires. 'This actual expreſſion of Honour to God is *Cultus Moda-'lis & ſecundarius*; a ſubſervient ſort of Worſhip. The 'ſame I ſay (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*) of Church *Vtenſils*. If 'for the honour of God and Religion, the Pulpits and 'Tables have ornaments of Silk: Cups, and Trenchers, 'and Flagons of Silver; the Fonts and Seats have ſome 'ſpecial neatneſs, *&c.* This is a ſecondary Worſhip, be-'ſides he ſaith the ſame of Miniſters habits. *Baxter againſt Ralphſon p.* 6. 7. 8.

Thus you ſee Mr. *Baxter* and the Papiſts do moſt exactly agree. But do the Proteſtants in very truth differ from Mr. *Baxter* in theſe things? yea verily.

§. 5. The eſtabliſhed Doctrine of the *Church* of *England* is directly againſt it. In the 3*d.* part of the *Homily againſt the peril of Idolatry* 'tis expreſs. 'Now it remaineth (ſaith 'the *Homily*) for the concluſion of this Treatiſe to de-'clare as well the *abuſes* of the Churches and Temples by too *coſtly* and *ſumptuous Deckings*, and adorning them.

'In

'In *Tertullians* time 160 years after Christ, Christians had 'none other Temples but common Houses, whether for the 'most part they did secretly resort. Lo, unto the time 'of *Constantine*, by the space of above 300 years after 'our Saviour Christ, when Religion was most *pure*, and 'indeed *Golden*, Christians had but Low and poor Con-'venticles, and simple Oratories, yea Caves under the 'ground called *Cryptæ*.

'And Saint *Jerome* toucheth the same matter somewhat 'more freely, of the life of the Clerks to *Nepotian*, say-'ing, Thus many build Walls, and erect Pillars of Chur-'es, the smooth Marbles do glister; the Roof shineth 'with Gold, the Altar is set with precious Stones. But 'of the Ministers of Christ there is no Election, or *Choice*: 'Neither let any man object or alledge against me the 'rich Temple that was in *Jury*, the Table, Candlesticks, 'Platters, Cups, and other things all of Gold.

'Then were these things all allowed of the Lord, 'when Priests offered Sacrifices, and the blood of 'Beasts was accounted the Redemption of Sins. How-'beit all these things went before in the *Figure*. And 'they were written for us upon whom the end of the 'World is come. And now when that our Lord being 'poor, hath dedicated the *Poverty* of his House; let us 'remember his Cross and we shall esteem Riches as Mire 'and Dung. What, do we marvail at that which Christ 'called *Wicked Mammon*? Whereto we do so highly e-'steem and love that which St. *Peter* doth for a glory te-'stifie that he had not. Hitherto St. *Jerome*. No more 'did the Old Godly Bishops and Doctors of the Church 'allow the over-sumptuous Furniture of Temples and 'Churches, with Plate, Vessels of Gold, Silver, and 'precious Vestments. St. *Chrysostome* saith, in the Mi-'nistry of the Holy Sacraments, there is no need of Golden

'Vessels,

'Veſſels, but of Golden Minds. And St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, 'the Sacraments look for no Gold, neither do they 'pleaſe God for the commendation of Gold. St. *Jerome* 'commendeth *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Tholoſe*, that he carried 'the Sacrament of the Lords Body in a *Wicker-Basket*, 'and the Sacrament of His Blood in a *Glaſs*, and ſo caſt 'Covetouſneſs out of the Church. And *Bonifacius* Biſh-'op and Martyr as is received in the decrees, teſtifieth, 'that in old time the Miniſters uſed *Wooden* and not Gol-'den Veſſels. And *Zepherinus* the 11th Biſhop of *Rome*, 'made a Decree that they ſhould uſe veſſels of Glaſs. So far the *Homily*.

By this you may ſee, that according to the Doctrine of the Church of England, Glorious and Stately Temples; Golden or Silver Veſſels; Gorgeous Apparel for the Miniſters are no parts of Worſhip, they are *Jewiſh Rites*, that muſt be laid aſide. There is no Religion to be placed in theſe things as Mr. *Baxter* with the Papiſts hath done. I ſay, Mr. *Baxter* places Religion in Temples, Gold Cups, and Platters, and the Priestly Habiliments, and neatneſs of the Churches or Temples, and cleanneſs of the Seats, for he makes them parts of External Divine Worſhip: But to do ſo, is both Jewiſh, and Antichriſtian, and hateful to the Church of England.

SECT. II.

Mr. Baxters *agreement with the* Papiſts *about ſome* Diſtinctions *grounded on this Notion of* External Worſhip

§. 1. THe Papiſts making all the above mentioned Circumſtances parts of Worſhip, and knowing that there is a difference between theſe things and ſome

ſome other momentous parts of Worſhip, they apply themſelves to the Exerciſe of their diſtinguiſhing faculty, and (as *Rivet* on the Second Commandment obſerves) diſtinguiſh between *Primary* and *Secundary Worſhip*; *Eſſential*, and *Accidental*; *Proper*, and *Improper*, or *Reductive Worſhip*. In like manner Mr. *Baxter* ſaith there are two ſorts of Worſhip, a *Firſt*, and *Second*, and that the *Secondary* is *Subordinate* and *Accidental* to the *Firſt* ſort of Worſhip. See *Baxter* againſt *Ralphſon* p. 3. *&c.* But Proteſtants have with invincible Reaſons exploded all ſuch diſtinctions.

§. 2. That the Papiſts may the more aſſuredly defend themſelves againſt the blow of ſeveral patt Texts of Scripture, which overthrow their Doctrines: They firſt diſtinguiſh between what is commanded in the *General*, and left to the Church in *Particular* to determine; and what is *Particularly* inſtituted. Beſides they diſtinguiſh between *Perfecting Additions* to the word and ſuch as are *Corrupting* and *Deſtructive* of the Word, in both which Diſtinctions there cannot be a more exact agreement than there is between Mr. *Baxter* and the *Papiſts* as I will hereafter with much clearneſs prove.

SECT. III.

The State *of the Controverſie about Divine Worſhip and Superſtition, as it lies between the* Papiſts *and* Proteſtants, and *Mr.* Baxters *Agreement with the* Papiſts.

§. 1. THe *Papiſts* in their diſcourſes about the *Worſhip* of God, and what is oppoſite thereunto, do make *Superſtition* to be one oppoſite by *Exceſs*, and *Irreligion* to be another by defect. For this Conſult *Aquinas*.

[1] *Aquinas.* [2] *Cajetan.* [3] *Gregory de Valentia.* [4] *Azorius.* *and* [5] *Filucius.*

[1] Aquinas; 22. q. 92. [2] Cajetan on Aquin. [3] Valent. disp. 6. quest. 11. punct. 1. [4] Azor. instit. mor. lib. 9. c. 11. [5] Filucii 9. tract. 24. c. 1.

[6]. §. II. *Superstition*, they say, is an *Exhibiting Worship* either to *whom* it ought *not*, or in another manner than it ought to be.

[6]. Superstitio est vitium Religioni oppositum—quia exhibet cultum Divinum, vel cui non debet, vel eo modo quo non debet. Aquin. ubi supra.

There are several distinctions which they use about Superstition, but I wave them as of no use in this place, and will only note, that they make Idolatry to be a *Species* of *Superstition*, affirming that the entire Nature of Idolatry (taken in a proper Sence) consists in the giving unto the Creature that Worship which is proper unto God. But

§. 3. The *Protestants* do generally affirm, that those who direct not their Worship to false Gods, may yet be guilty of Idolatry by directing it to the true God in a false way.

Because here lieth the parting point between Papists and Protestants, I will be the more exact in what I shall say.

Let the Reader then observe, that in the menage of this Controversie, the *Papists* are aware, that the making the *Second Commandment* to be distinct from the *First Commandment* is to yield the Cause to the Protestants, and therefore they use all the craft they can to mould them into one, and when they talk of dividing them, all their care is to darken plain Truths by a multitude of obscure words. Thus the Jesuite *Arriaga* (in his *Tractate de Legib. disp.* 9. *Sect.* 5.) tells us, that 'tis not material, whether you hold the first Table to contain 4 or but 3 Commandments, but then on a Supposition that there are four Commandments in the first Table he would take in [the Preface] for the first Commandment; but generally they

ſay there are but three in the firſt Table, and ſeven in the ſecond, dividing the tenth into two, and make the firſt and ſecond of the firſt Table to be but one, forbidding only the worſhip of falſe Gods, which they ſay muſt not be at all, no not by Images.

But the Proteſtants have by the ſtrength and clearneſs of Scripture Texts impregnably evinced, that there are four Commandments in the firſt *Table*; that the firſt is [*Thou ſhalt not have any other Gods before me*] and the ſecond is [*Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Images*, &c.] That the firſt Commandment forbids the giving Divine Worſhip to any but unto the true God; and the ſecond ſhews, that we muſt worſhip him in the way of his own appointments and not after our own imaginations. The firſt directs us to the only *proper Object* of Divine Worſhip, and the ſecond ſhews us the only right *Author* of that Worſhip, God the only true Object, is the only right Author of Divine Worſhip. The firſt Efficient is the laſt End, the Author and the Object are *really* (though not *formally*) the ſame; and the firſt Commandment ſhews us the Object, and the ſecond the Author. The firſt directs us to whom we muſt give Divine Worſhip, and the ſecond ſhews the way and manner how, *eo modo quo debet, ſeu quo non debent*; Or from whom alone we muſt receive the the Rules of Worſhip.

Whoever will conſult *Calvin*, *Jacobus Herbrandus*, *Zanchy*, and the multitude of reformed Writers, and compare them with the *Romaniſts*, will find that the true State of the Controverſy between the Proteſtants and Papiſts lies here, [whether the *Worſhipping the true God, eo modo quo non debet*, in another way than God has inſtituted, *be properly Idolatry*?] That to do ſo is in a *Metaphorical* Sence (as Covetouſneſs and all other ſins are a departure from God, and a going after the Creature inordinately) Idolatry the Papiſts

Papiſts grant. But then taking Idolatry in a proper Sence, they tell us that it is a *Species* of Superſtition, and conſiſts only in the giving to the Creature that Worſhip, which is proper unto God, and that to Worſhip the true God in another manner than he has commanded either in the *Word*, or by the *Church* in *Superſtition* whence they conclude, that they are not guilty of Idolatry, becauſe they direct their Worſhip to the true God only; nor are they guilty of *Superſtition* becauſe they worſhip God in all reſpects as the Lord requires either by his *Word* or *Church*.

The Proteſtants on the other hand affirm, that to worſhip God in another manner than he has required, is Idolatry; it is a Violation of the ſecond Commandment, a *making to our ſelves ſomewhat to worſhip God by*, that there is in the breach of the Second Commandment ſomewhat of the *formal* nature of that Idolatry forbidden in the firſt Commandment, for as the laſt end of worſhip is the *principal Object*, ſo the firſt efficient is the laſt end. All Worſhip is Service, all Service is Obedience; and his Servants, [his Worſhippers] ye are whom you obey. To uſe any thing in Worſhip, as a part thereof, not commanded by God, or meerly becauſe Man commands, is to ſerve and worſhip Man, the Creature, not God the Creator. Beſides they ſay, that the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture doth not only charge us to take heed, that *we worſhip not the true God, as the Heathens worſhip their Gods. Deut.* 12.31.32. Nor after the imagination of our own Hearts, but it calls the worſhipping the true God after *this undue manner* [*Will-worſhip*, *Idolatry*, *Spiritual Adultery*, and a *Worſhipping of Devils.*] Moreover the Proteſtants add, that the Lord Chriſt has not entruſted the Church, nor any in it, to add to the worſhip of God, but the commiſſion is to teach whatever Chriſt commands; What names

or Titles ſoever may be given to the Worſhip, whether called *Proper* or *Improper*, *Eſſential* or *Accidental*; *Firſt* or *Secondary*, and *Subordinate*, if it be worſhip, if expreſſive of the Reverence of the Heart of God, it muſt be either *Natural*, or *Inſtitute*, or *Superſtitious*, and *Idolatrous*. That this is the true State of the controverſie between Papiſts and Proteſtants about matters of Worſhip will ſoon appear to any who will but conſult the Writings both of Papiſts and Proteſtants; or if we do but compare *Calvin* (*lib.* 4. *inſtitut*; *c.* 10.) with *Bellarmine* (*de effect. Sacrament. lib.* 2. c. 32. *& de Imag. lib.* 2. c 13, or *Jacobus Herbrandus*, a *Lutheran*, with *Gregory de Valentia* a *Jeſuite*, or indeed if we do but ſearch the writings of any who have conſultedly treated of the Subject, we ſhall find that here lies the true ſtate of the Queſtion, namely whether *Idolatry be any more than a giving to the Creature that Worſhip which is proper unto God?* Or, *Whether to Worſhip the true God in another way than he has inſtituted, be properly Idolatry?* Or *Whether the Papiſts, when they worſhip the true God only, can be guilty of Idolatry*, becauſe *they worſhip in a way not inſtituted by God.*

Now the Papiſts averr, that unleſs they give to the Creature that Worſhip which is proper unto God only, they cannot be guilty of Idolatry. And the Proteſtants, on the contrary, are poſitive in affirming that in many caſes, when they worſhip the true God, they may be guilty of Idolatry, and that becauſe they worſhip him in another way than he has required; and for proof thereof do ſhew that the Idolatry of the Heathen generally conſiſted not ſo much in directing their Worſhip to one that was not God, as in directing it to the true God in a *way God commanded them not.* The like is ſaid of the Idolatry of the *Iſraelites*, to worſhip God *eo modo quo non debet* is Idolatry, properly Idolatry.

For

For confirmation of this, I'le ſingle out one or two Jeſuites who do grant that the Controverſie between Papiſts and Proteſtants about falſe worſhip doth lie here.

I might inſtance in many, but I'le confine my diſcourſe to *Vincentius Filucius*, and *Gregory de Valentia*.

'[1] *Filucius* ſaith that the Queſtion touching *Superſtition* 'is, whether all *Humane Worſhip* be *Superſtitious*, and he 'in his anſwer affirmeth. 1. That the Hereticks of this 'time (*viz.* the Proteſtants) do aſſert, that all Worſhip 'of Humane Invention is Superſtitious, and that they 'ground this their opinion on *Deut.* 12. Where 'tis plain '(*That whatever thing I command you, obſerve to do it*, thou 'ſhalt *not add thereto*, nor *diminiſh from it*,) From which 'place the Proteſtants infer, that what Worſhip ſoever is 'not commanded, is forbidden, but the Catholicks contra-'rily do hold, that not every thing not commanded is Super-'ſtition, but every thing that is againſt either a Divine or 'an Eccleſiaſtical command is Superſtitious, So far *Filucius*.

'But [2] *Gregory de Valentia* comes more cloſe to the very 'point of Idolatry, for (on *Thomas*) he ſaith. The con-'troverſies between us and the Sectaries (*viz.* Proteſtants) 'is this, *viz.* Whether Idolatry taken in a proper Sence,

[1] Quinto, Quæro, An omnis cultus humanus Superſtitioſus ſit? Reſp. Hæreticos hujus temporis aſſerere omnem cultum humano diſcurſu introductum eſſe Superſtitioſum, ex illo Deut. 12. quod præcipio tibi, hoc tantum facito domino, neque addas quicquam, nec minuas; ideoque colligunt omnem cultum non præceptum, eſſe prohibitum. Dico tamen, non quicquid præceptum non eſt hoc ipſo ſuperſtitioſum eſt, ſed quicquid eſt contra Præceptum, ſive Divinum ſive Eccleſiaſticum, id erit ſuperſtitioſum. *Filuc. Moral.* Queſt. tract. 24. c1. n9

[2] Controverſia nobis eſt cum Sectariis, An Idololatria propriè ſit ſolùm impius ille cultus, quo Divinus honor tribuitur Creaturæ alicui, ſicut Deo, ita ut, hæc ipſa cenſenda ſit vera & genuina definitio idololatriæ propriæ dictæ. Affirmant enim omnes Catholici, neque ulli unquam Orthodoxorum Doctorum in mentem venit. Idololatriam propriè eſſe aliud quam hoc ipſum. Sectarii autem novatores contendunt, non id tantum modo eſſe idololatriam propriè: Cenſent enim propriè eſſe idololatriam omnem omnino cultùm etiam *veri Dei, ſine Dei verbo & mandato uſurpatur.* Quamcuncunque exerceatur optima intentione colendi *Verum* Deum. *Valentia diſp. 6. queſt. 9. punct. 1.*

be

'be only that wicked Worſhip whereby Divine Honour 'is given unto the Creature, as unto God, whether this be 'a true and genuine definition of Idolatry, taken properly. 'All the *Catholicks* affirm it, and it never entred into the 'Heart of any Orthodox Divine to think otherwiſe. But 'the Innovating Sectaries do ſay that ſomewhat elſe is Ido-'latry, for they eſteem all that worſhip of the true God 'which is beſide the *Word* or *Command* of God, to be pro-'per Idolatry, yea though it to rendred to the true God 'with the moſt ſincere Intentions.

Thus we ſee that the great Controverſie between Proteſtants and Papiſts is, whether Idolatry conſiſts only in worſhipping of falſe Gods, or whether it be not Idolatry to worſhip the true God in a falſe *Way* (*i.e.*) in a way he never inſtituted. Now *Herbrandus* a Lutherane, and all the firſt Reformers, yea, the Church of *England*, but eſpecially the Old Nonconformiſts affirm, that to worſhip God in a falſe way, in a way which God himſelf has not inſtituted, is a breach of the Second Commandment, Idolatry, and Antichriſtian.

But Mr. *Baxter* joyns with the *Papiſts* in aſſerting, 'that there is much uninſtituted Worſhip which is lawful. 'He gives us twenty Inſtances of ſuch Worſhip, and alſo 'tells us, that to ſay all inſtituted Worſhip is Idolatry, is to 'make the Apoſtles Idolatrous, and the Primitive Churches 'Idolatrous, yea 'its a denyal of Chriſt and all the Goſpel, 'and Work of Mans Redemption. All this, and much more doth Mr. *Baxter* charge Mr. *Ralphſon* with, for ſaying, that Worſhip not inſtituted is falſe worſhip. That there is a refined Idolatry; and that joyning in a Worſhip not Inſtituted, is a going after *Baal*, to *Dan* and *Bethel*, *Babylon* and *Idols*, and by conſequence Mr. *Baxter* chargeth all the Proteſtant Divines generally with theſe Odious Reproaches, for they all ſay the ſame, that Un-

in-

inſtituted Worſhip is falſe Worſhip, it is Superſtition and Idolatry. Yea the Church of *England* her ſelf, agrees with the reformed Proteſtants in this; and heretofore in their Controverſie with the Nonconformiſts they deny the Uninſtituted Ceremonies, in debate, to be *parts of Worſhip*; they ſay that Worſhip not inſtituted is falſe and unlawful,

I will be yet more diſtinct in ſhewing how far Mr. *Baxter* agrees with the *Papiſts*, and differs from ſound Proteſtants.

SECT. IV.

Mr. Baxters *Agreement with the* Papiſts *in the* Anſwers *they give unto the Proteſtants Arguments againſt the Popiſh Worſhip.*

§. 1. THe Argument on which the Proteſtants do chiefly inſiſt in the oppoſition which they make againſt the Superſtitious Worſhip of the Papiſts is this.

All Uninſtituted Worſhip is falſe Worſhip, Superſtitious and Idolatrous.

But the Romiſh *worſhip is uninſtituted Worſhip. Ergo.*

Here the Reader muſt obſerve that the matter in Controverſie is Worſhip, *viz.* Whether the *Romiſh Worſhip be true or falſe.* By Worſhip is meant whatever is made a *direct* or *immediate expreſſion of the Reverence* of *the Heart to God*, ſo that the things, which in particular fall under our debate are only ſuch things as are uſed as parts of Worſhip. By what Names or Titles ſoever the Worſhip may be diſtinguiſhed, it is Worſhip (*i. e.*) ſomewhat that is uſed to expreſs the Reverence of the Heart to God which is in controverſie.

Thus much I think Requiſite to mention, to the end the *Reader* may ſee what Reaſon there is, why we ſhould di-

diſtinguiſh between *Falſe Worſhip*, and the *Sins* the *Worſhiper* may be guilty of, when *He worſhips God*, and how much both the Papiſts and Mr. *Baxter* run from the point in hand, when they upbraid us with the *Sins* a man is guilty of, when he comes to worſhip God, as if they were Table worſhips; to which I only anſwer, that either the *Sins* a man is guilty of when he worſhippeth God, are done to expreſs the Reverence of the Heart to God, or not; if not, they are no parts of Worſhip; and therefore not falſe woſhip; but if they are done to expreſs the Reverence of the Heart to God and are made parts of the Worſhip, 'tis falſe Worſhip, Superſtition, and Idolatry, for it is and honouring God with our *Sin*, which thing the Diſſenters abhor.

This being ſo very plain, I will go on to ſhew how much Mr. *Baxter* agrees with the Papiſts in the oppoſition made unto this Argument of the Proteſtants.

As the Papiſts deny uninſtituted Worſhip to be falſe Worſhip, ſo doth Mr. *Baxter*, who gives us twenty inſtances of uninſtituted Worſhip, which he ſaith is *Lawful*, And amongſt the many Inſtances that are given of his (*Lawful uninſtituted Worſhip*) there is an agreement in theſe ſeveral particulars, namely in Vows uncommanded, *Free-will-offerings*, The *keeping the Memorials of Gods Works*, *ſometimes by pitching Stones*, *ſometimes by Pillars*, *ſometimes by ſettt-dayes*, (*as the Feaſt of Purim*) *ſometimes by laying up the Enſigns*, (as *Goliahs* Sword,) So far Mr. *B.* againſt *Ralphſon*, p. 10. 18. The which is no other than what the Papiſts generally, and *Bellarmine* and *Valentia* in particular do bring againſt the Proteſtants. 'Our Judge-'ment againſt the Heriticks (ſaith *Bellarmine*) lies in this 'Aſſertion only, *viz.* (That it is *Lawful* for the *Church to in-'ſtitute new Ceremonies*, not to obtain the Remiſſion of 'Sins mortal, but for other ends. This is proved from the 'example of the Synagogue, or of private men in the Old

'Teſta-

'Teſtament. Thus *Jacob* a private Man did invent a new Ce-
'remony in erecting a Pillar at *Bethel*, and thus the Syna-
'gogue in the days of *Mordecai* did add a new Feaſt,
'*viz.* the Feaſt of *Purim*, which was not inſtituted of God;
'the like did the Apoſtles, they did inſtitute many things
'which were not enjoyned by the Word of God. So
'far *Bellarmine*. And Mr. *Baxter* tells us what they were.
'Namely, The Chriſtians at firſt ſold all, and laid
'it at the Apoſtles feet, which yet *Peter* tells *Ananias* he
'might have choſen not to do. And ſo *Paul* would have
'the *Corinthians* give their Collections, as to God, for
'the Saints. But no inſtitution told them how much they
'ſhould give, but the general Rule.

Noſtra Propoſitio ſolùm aſſerit contra Hæreticos, licere Eccleſiæ inſtituere novas Ceremonias, non ad juſtificandum à peccatis mortalibus, ſed ad alios fines. Probatur, 1. exemplo ſynagogæ vel hominum privatorum in Teſtam: veteri.——*Jacob*, cum nondum Patriarcha eſſet, ſed privatus homo.—— Novam Ceremoniam excogitavit, erexit enim lapidem, *&c.* Item Synagoga, Judæorum, Auctore *Mordachæo* addidit novum feſtum, diem ſolennem omnibus celebrandis quem Deus non inſtituerat in lege——Secundò probatur ex Apoſtolorum exemplo——Præterea probavimus multa alia Apoſtolos inſtituiſſe, licet in Scripturis non habeantur. Bellarm. de effect. Sacr. lib. 2. c. 31.

Evidentiſſimè conſtat ex Scriptura, cultus aliquos voluntarios eſſe Deo gratos, quamvis à Deo non ſunt præcepti: Ut Votum & Juramentum, & obſervatio aliquorum dierum feſtorum ob beneficiorum memoriam. Valent. diſp. 6 quæſt. 1. punct. 7. de Oratione.

Beſides *Gregory de Valentia* in his diſcourſes of Idolatry againſt *Herbrandus*, and in his *Diſputations about Superſtition*, yea, where he *treats of the State of the Religious, and of Works of Supererrogation* and *Vows*, gives us the ſame inſtances to prove that an uninſtituted Worſhip is lawful, which Mr. *Baxter* gives. I will at this time only mention what he ſaith in defence of Praying unto Saints, where this objection, *viz.* ('*Worſhip not commanded of God*, is 'ſinful; but *Invocation of Saints is Worſhip not commanded* '*of God*, ergo, *ſinful*,) is thus anſwered. It is manifeſt 'out of Scripture that there are ſeveral inſtances wherein

'Voluntary or Uninſtituted worſhip is both *Lawfull*, and 'acceptable with God, ſuch as *Vowes*, *Oaths*, and the *Ob-ſervation* of many things, to wit, *Feaſt days* in commemo-'ration of ſome ſpecial mercies received. All theſe 'are without a particular command, and yet lawful. Thus we ſee that as the Papiſts do, in anſwer to the Proteſtants Arguments againſt the Romiſh Worſhip, diſtinguiſh be-tween two ſorts of Worſhip, and produce ſeveral In-ſtances of the ſecond, to ſhew that uninſtituted Worſhip may be lawful, ſo doth Mr. *Baxter*.

SECT. V.

The Agreement *between Mr.* Baxter *and the* Papiſts *in their Anſwers to ſeveral* Texts of Scripture, *that are urged by the* Proteſtants *for the proving all uninſtituted Worſhip to be falſe Worſhip.*

§. 1. THe *Proteſtants* do urge theſe Scriptures, *Deut.* 4. 2. *& ch.* 12. 31, 32. *Prov.* 30. 6. *Jer.* 7. *Iſa.* 29. 13. *Math.* 15. 7, 8, 9. *Math.* 28. 20. where all additions to or taking from the Word, are moſt ſtrictly forbidden.

Reader, I deſire you to mark, that theſe very Texts, which are inſiſted on by the Learned Proteſtants a-gainſt the Papiſts to prove all uninſtituted Worſhip to be unlawful, are the very ſame Dr. *Owen* inſiſts on, and the very anſwers Mr. *Baxter* gives them, are the very ſame that *Bellarmine* has de *effect. Sacrament. lib.* 2. *c.* 31. And *de Romano Pontif. lib.* 4. *c.* 17. as I will particularly ſhew.

§. 2. Mr. *Baxter* in giving an anſwer to theſe Texts, gives us the Popiſh Diſtinctions between 'Primary, or 'Eſſential; and ſecondary, Subordinate, or Accidental 'worſhip: And between a General allowance, and a 'particular Inſtitution: And ſaith, that theſe Scriptures only

'only forbid additions to Primary, but not to Secondary 'Worſhip: And that Secondary Worſhip though with-'out a particular Inſtitution, yet is lawful becauſe in-'cluded in a general command. Let all *things be done to 'Edification, Decently, and in Order.* Obey *thoſe that 'have the Rule over you.* This much is the ſtrength of Mr. *Baxters* Anſwer unto what both Mr. *Ralphſon* and Dr. *Owen* ſay, to prove Uninſtituted Worſhip unlawful. But this much is ſaid by *Bellarmine*, who in Anſwer to the Proteſtants diſtinguiſheth betwen a *General*, and a *Particular Allowance*, affirming it ſufficient to make the Worſhip lawful if it be commanded in the *General.* Let us then,

§. 3. Conſult [1] *Bellarmine (ubi ſupra)* and we ſhall find that he layes down this Objection [no Worſhip is lawful but what is inſtituted, or at leaſt hath ſome Countenances from the word] to which his anſwer is, either it is requiſite that God approve of the Worſhip particularly, and expreſly; or 'tis ſufficient that God doth it more generally. But the firſt is not requiſite, *ergo*, the laſt is Sufficient. Beſides *Bellarmine* doth ground this diſtinction of a General and Particular Allowance on the

[1] Object. Deo enim non placet ullus cultus quem ipſe non inſtituit, aut certè cui non dederit Teſtimonium verbo ſuo. At contra, nam aut requiretur ut in Particulari & expreſſe Deus approbaverit cultum aut ſufficit ſi in genere & in Virtute probaverit Non poteſt dici primum, Deo *viz*, non placere cultum quem ipſe in Particulari expreſſe non probaverit.—Ergo ſatis erit ſi in genere Deus aliquid probaverit. Cum Deus jubet Obediri Præpoſitis in genere, jubet ſervari omnes leges Eccleſiaſticas.

[2] Non prohibet Dominus in his locis quamlibet additionem—ſed additionem corrumpentem. Poteſt autem duobus modis fieri corruptio. Uno modo ſi quis ipſis Dei verbis, aut Præceptis aliquid addat aut minuat quo illa corrumpantur, ut ſiquis in Sacrificiis Chriſti offerat panem ſine vino, aut panem & vinum & mel. Alio modo, ſi quis venditaret pro Dei verbo, librum non canonicum, aut pro Sacramento Ceremoniam aliquam a ſe inventam, &c. Conſult. Bellarm. de Romano Pontif. lib. 4. c. 17. And you will find much more to the ſame purpoſe; for in this place *Bellarmine* attempts a particular anſwer to all the above mentioned Texts.

Command of obeying the Higher Powers, and the Governours of the Church, and that Mr. *Baxter* doth ſo too, is manifeſt, for when Dr. *Owen* aſſerted, that it inſeperably belongs to the Kingly *Office of Chriſt to be ſole* Lawgiver *of the Church in all the worſhip of God*, Mr. *Baxter* p. 30. replies 'That 'this is a miſtake, and tells us that there is a ſecondary 'Worſhip, which Men may make Laws about. Princes 'may make Laws for the particular uſe of *Secondary* Wor-'ſhip; and the Paſtour may by *mandate oblige* the People to much of the like. And what is in thoſe Inſtances of Secondary 'Worſhip impoſed by Men, depends not on their Autho-'rity alone, but on Gods, who authorizeth Rulers to do it; 'For he has ſaid *let all things be done to Edification*, In or-'der, *Obey them that have the Rule.*

§. 4. Furthermore [2] *Bellarmine* affirms that in the above mentioned Scriptures God doth not forbid all, but ſome Additions, namely *Corrupting Additions*, which may be made to the word of God after a twofold manner, ſaith he, 'Firſt of all, if any one ſhall add to, or take from the 'Words or Commands of God, ſo as that thereby they 'are broken, which is done when any one in the Sa-'crifices of Chriſt ſhall offer Bread without Wine, or 'Bread, Wine and Honey: or it may be done thus, namely, 'if any one ſhould make that to be Gods Word, which is 'not, which may be done by adding a Book not Canonical 'to the Canonical Scriptures, or if any ſhall invent a Ce-'remony, and make a Sacrament of it, *&c.* So far *Bellarmine*; who you ſee ſpeaks the very ſame things Mr. *B.* doth in anſwer to the *Dr's* firſt argument, where he ſaith, 'Your wrong expoſition of all the Texts of Scripture 'here cited by you, is more than one miſtake. *Deut.* 4. 2. '*&* 12. 30. *Prov.* 30. 6. *forbid adding to Gods Worſhip.* 'Which is broken by all that either ſay, that that is in 'Gods Word, which is not there, or that deviſe any

'with

'Worſhip-Ordinances co-ordinate, or of the ſame ſort with 'his own, as if they were imperfect; but there is not one 'word forbidding Subordinate Secondary Acts of Worſhip.

SECT. VI.

An Agreement between Mr. Baxter *and the* Papiſts *in their way of arguing againſt the Notion the* Proteſtants *have about Unlawful, Falſe, or Idolatrous Worſhip.*

§. I. IT has been already ſhewn that the Proteſtants do own all uninſtituted Worſhip to be unlawful, falſe, ſuperſtitious, and Idolatrous.

§. II. Dr. *Owen* alſo affirmed all Uninſtituted Worſhip to be unlawful, and Mr. *Ralphſon* ſpeaking of a refined Idolatry, calls it Idolatrous. But the Old Nonconformiſts were more bold in their aſſertions, for they ſaid that all *Uninſtituted Worſhip was Idolatrous and Antichriſtian.*

§. III. 'The Papiſts in the oppoſition they make againſt the Proteſtants, argue thus, *'If all uninſtituted Worſhip, 'if all Worſhip that is without the Word or Command 'of God as the Sectaries (*viz.* the Proteſtant Hereticks af-'firm be Idolatrous, then it will follow, that all that worſhip 'of God which fails of coming up to the word in any cir-'cumſtances, is Idolatry, which once granted, it unavoida-'ble follows; that whoever prayes for vain Glory ſake, is an

* Si Idololatria proprie eſt etiam cultus vero Deo adhibitus ſine verbo & mandato Dei (ut Sectarii contendunt) conſequens erit, ut omnis Dei cultus quacunq; ex circumſtantia pravus & illicitus propriè ſit Idololatria; quemadmodum fater coactus fuit Herbrandus: Siquidem omnis cultus quomodocunque pravus caret Verbo Dei & mandato. At hinc multa ſequuntur abſurda—Sequitur enim eum eſſe propriè Idololatriam, qui orat (verbi gratia) propter vanam gloriam—Item, Sequeretur ipſos etiam Sectarios eſſe propriè Idololatras cum orant (ſi tamen orant) mente alienis cogitationibus diſtracta, aut quidpiam aliud in qualicunque cultu ob aliquam pravam circumſtantiam peccant.

Idolater,

'Idolater, yea 'twill follow that the Sectaries themſelves 'are Idolaters, for that when they pray (if they pray at all) 'their minds are diſtracted with vain thoughts, and the 'beſt of them fail in many other Circumſtances. This much is urged by *Gregory de Valentia* diſp. 6. qu. 11. *punct.* 1.

§. IV. Mr. *Baxter* argues after the ſame rate, for ſaith he, in his anſwer to Dr. *Owen*, and Mr. *Ralphſon*, If all uninſtituted Worſhip be unlawful or Idolatrous, then is Mr. *Ralphſon* an Idolater, yea all the Church of God, yea the Apoſtles themſelves, for they all worſhipped God with ſome of his twenty Inſtances of Secondary Worſhip without an inſtitution. Yea this is the burden of all Mr. *B*'s. late Writings againſt the Nonconforming Diſſenters; if we muſt not hold Communion with thoſe who worſhip God with a Worſhip that in ſome reſpects is diſagreeable to the Rule, and Uninſtitute, we muſt hold Communion with none on Earth; no, not with our ſelves. For this reaſon 'twill be endleſs to quote all that he ſaith of this particular.

SECT. VII.

An agreement between Mr. Baxter, *and ſome* Papiſts *about communicating with others in a falſe Worſhip with a* mental *diſowning the Corruptions, even when* Locally *preſent as one of the Worſhippers, the corrupt way.*

§. I. THat there are many Corruptions in the controverted Worſhip, which muſt by no means be approved of, Mr. *Baxter* doth affirm, witneſs his firſt Nonconformiſts Plea, and many other of his Writings.

§. II. That if the preſent Dioceſane Church frame be deſtructive of the Congregational Species of the Churches Miniſtry

Miniſtry and Diſcipline; 'tis deſtructive of Chriſts inſtitutions, and as ſuch we ought by no means to communicate with any in it.

§. III. But yet though Corruptions in Worſhip be very great, we may *Locally* communicate with a People in the Worſhip that is corrupt, though not in the Corruptions of the Worſhip, and although the Law requires our joyning in the whole Worſhip, yet our preſence at the Worſhip in Obedience to the Law, is not an overt act of our approving what is Corrupt. That there is ſome good in the Worſhip is manifeſt, and ſeeing the Law, that requires our Conformity, requires our doing ſome good, we may obey them ſo far as they command what is good, and be preſent only as approvers of what is good, even when we mentally ſeperate from and diſown what is evil and corrupt. This is, I count, a juſt State of Mr. *Baxters* Principles about Communicating with the Pariſh Churches.

§. IV. But here it muſt be obſerved, that whoever goes to the Place of Worſhip, and there continues the whole time of Worſhip without any open declaration of his approbation of, but a part of the Worſhip, or without telling what parts of Worſhip he likes, and what not; how far he obeys the Law, and how far not; his *Fact* being the ſame with that of thoſe, who approve of the whole, he is there indiſtinctly as one of them, and his ſeparation being but from a part of the Worſhip, and that *mentally*, even whilſt he is *Corporally* preſent at the whole, the fact, or local preſence of this Man is as much an overt act of his communicating with them in the whole, as it is of any part, and beſpeaks his obedience to the whole Law as much as to any part of it, for which reaſon a *Proteſtation* is neceſſary.

§. V. This I think Mr. *Baxter* cannot deny, and therefore tells us, that he has oft in his publique writings declared

clared how much he likes, and how much he diſlikes. But notwithſtanding all this, there remains another difficulty, to wit, the reconciling this verbal proteſtation to the proteſtation of the *Fact*: for there is the Language of the *Fact*, and that is as much for a compliance with the whole worſhip, as with a part. For 'tis the ſame in all, and ſpeaks the ſame thing at one time as at another, that is, on ſuppoſition he demeans himſelf as one of the Congregation all the time, and ſo we muſt ſuppoſe in this caſe, his Fact beſpeaketh his approving of all that is commanded, and his obedience muſt be looked on by Aſſiſtants to be compleat, and not partial.

§. VI. To ſolve all difficult appearances about this matter, the whole Mr. *Baxter* and his party can ſay for themſelves is very plainly expreſſed by another hand, who writing in defence of Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, 'I muſt add this 'much more yet in his behalf, That whereas the diſpute between him (*i. e.*) Mr. B. and his chief oppoſer, (*viz.* 'the Author of Mr. *Baxters* Judgement) lies in this point, 'whether it be lawful to communicate with the Pariſh Aſ-'ſemblies, as by Law required? I muſt ſay that the Que-'ſtion thus propoſed, includes a Fallacy *plurium interroga-'tionum* as we call it. The only enquiry ſhould be whe-'ther *we may go to Church*, the *Law requiring it*? The word '(as by Law required) includes, I ſay, another, or farther 'interrogation, which is not needful to be anſwered: and 'therefore is fallacious; which I put in as a ſuppletory 'to what that worthy good Man has omitted. The Law 'requires that we go to our Pariſh Church, whether as to 'a part only of the Dioceſane, or as to a true particular 'Church agreeable to Chriſts appointment, is a matter of 'contention, which is needleſs, and it may be endleſs. 'It is enough that it is lawful for us to go to Church. 'There is this difference between the Law of Man and Gods.

'Gods. That when our obedience to *Him* muſt not only 'be in the *matter*, but in the *Manner* of his Commands, 'to be acceptable to Him. If the thing which the Law 'of Man requires be but in the *Matter* done, (and may be 'done) there is no more comes into examination. So far this Author.

§. VII. 'Tis no part of my Province here to examine the ſtrength of this anſwer, I leave that to Mr. *Baxter's* cheif oppoſer, as this Author calls him; and only endeavour the finding out the Sence of the diſtinction, and ſhew the Paralel between it and what the Papiſts ſay. The Law of Man requires our going to the Pariſh Church, this is the matter of Command, but whether we worſhip God this way or another way, or joyn with the Pariſh Church as Dioceſane or Congregational; this falls not under the matter, but the Forme, the manner of the command. If you go to the pariſh Church, if the thing which the Law of Man requires be but in the matter done, there is no more comes into examination.

§. VIII. This diſtinction is the ſame which was uſed by the Papiſts, who the firſt ten years of *Q. Elizabeths* Reign, went to the Pariſh Churches, notwithſtanding they eſteemed them Heretical, and very corrupt. They would go to Church, their Obedience to the Law ſhould be in the *matter*, for that was good, but in the manner they would not obey, and therefore though they went to Church yet they would would pray Catholickly. This was the Opinion of *Gregory Martin*, a Man famous for Learning and Piety amongſt the *Papiſts*, as was apprehended by many.

§. IX. Moreover he that wrote againſt going to Church, though with a Proteſtation, and thought better of Mr. *Martin* than ſome others, doth acknowledge that in ſome Caſes their may be a going to Church, and obeying the Law *Materially*, not *Formally*. I'le give you his own words.

'I do not doubt, saith he, but that Mr. *Gregory Martin*, as 'a man of blessed Memory, and of singular Learning doth 'worthyly admit of a Protestation in some Cases. For this 'of going to Church is then unlawful, when it is, (that is 'when the Action is) a Protestation of Conformity in 'Religion, which it is always, when there is such orderly 'going as is used by the Hereticks themselves. Now it may 'be that in divers cases this Orderlines and Conformity 'may be wanting, and then the going to Church with He-'reticks is but a *Material* going, and not a *Formal*, because 'the Formality is by the Alteration of the Essential Con-'ditions of such going, taken away. In this case therefore 'when going to Church is no such Protestation of false 'Religion, it is not unlawful of it self. So that for to a-'void Scandal, if there be any danger thereof, I make a 'a Protestation, wherein I shew my going to be only *Ma-'terial*, not *Formal*, an example or two we may shew out 'of the Scriptures. The going of the People with *Jero-'boam* to *Bethel*, when he there was to Sacrifice, was a *For-'mal going to Idolatry*, because they went orderly all alike, 'but the coming thither of the Prophets to reprehend the 'King was only a *material* going to Idolatry; and very 'well known to be of a diverse Nature from the other. '*Naaman Syrus* was *materially* present at Idolatry, but not. '*Formally*, because he went not to the Temple, as to a Tem-'ple, but as unto any other place where his particular *Tem-'poral* service might be exacted, neither did he obey 'his King, commanding an Act of Religion, but as requi-'ring only the *Temporal Assistance*, which to his greatness 'was convenient. Now if *Naaman* had seen any proba-'bility of scandal, then should he have been bound to have 'made a Protestation. Generally therefore when there 'is no contrary Protestation in the Fact, that is, when go-'ing to the Church with Hereticks is only *material*, and not

for-

'*Formal*; then may a Proteſtation be very well uſed in 'words, which nevertheleſs is not neceſſary, but in dan-'ger of Scandal. So far this Author.

§. X. On the whole, I obſerve, that this diſtinction of going to Idolatrous or Heretical Temples *materially* and not *formally*, has been generally received amongſt the Papiſts, and that the true Reaſon why the generality of Papiſts did at laſt oppoſe going to Proteſtant Churches on this ground, was becauſe their being in the Churches *indiſtinctly*, as one of the Hereticks, was a *Proteſtation in Fact* of their being one of them, and that though their *Verbal* Proteſtation might contradict, yet it could not alter this other Proteſtation, which was *real in Fact*. This much is manifeſt out of the ſame Author, who brings in Mr. *M.* ſaying, *A man may lawfully go to Church with Hereticks, if he* proteſt *that he goeth to pray Catholickly. True it is* (replieth *my Author*) *if he not only proteſteth to pray Catholickly, but prayeth indeed* Catholickly, *and is there Catholickly preſent, which he cannot then do, if he be* indiſtinctly *amongſt them, whatever Prayers he ſay, for his* Fact *is a* Proteſtation *that he is there to pray, in Heretical Union*, and *Participation, and that moſt of all, if he proteſt that he cometh for* Obedience, *for the end of ſuch* Obedience *is a Participation with Hereticks in Conformity with them.*

§. XI. This much may ſuffice to ſhew that all Papiſts agree in the diſtinction of Material and Formal Obedience to humane Laws, of Material and Formal going to Idolatrous Temples, or places of corrupt Worſhip, that the Church Papiſts were of an opinion that a Verbal *Proteſtation* was ſufficient to ſhew that their going was but Material, but the other *Papiſts* and the more prevailing party did judge the Proteſtation in Fact to make too lowd a noiſe to be drown'd with the Verbal contradictory *Proteſtation*, and that the *Proteſter* muſt be one way or

other al ar, for the Verbal Proteſtation was contradictory to what was real in Fact, and if one was true, the other was falſe.

§. XII. But Mr. *Baxter* and his Friend are for a material going to Church without a formal, for a going to the Pairſh Church, not as it is Dioceſane, and by Law eſtablſhied, but as contrary thereunto, and for ought that I can obſerve without any proteſtation at all at the time of going, but what is in Fact; and a proteſtation of their participation with the Pariſhes in their Corruptions, for they are there *orderly* and *indiſtinctly* as one of them. And why might not the 3 Children as well have bowed before the Image *Nebuchadnezzer* ſet up, and have prayed to the true God; and have ſatisfied themſelves with this diſtinction, they obeyed only *materially*, not *formally*.

§. XIII. In fine, nothing more commonly aſſerted by thoſe, who thought the Proteſtant Religion to be the moſt true; yet, when in danger of humane Laws, would go to the Maſs, and ſay that they went there with their *Bodies* only, and not with their *Spirits*. Their Souls they reſerved for God, and *mentally* ſeperated from their Worſhip, when *Corporally* preſent; and according to Mr. *Baxter*, methinks this ſhould be a ſufficient plea, for by the ſame Rule he is preſent at one part of corrupt worſhip, and be innocent by the help of a mental Reſervation, why may not another be preſent at another part of Corrupt Worſhip, and be as innocent. For this mental Reſervation will keep the Soul as clear in one reſpect as well as in another, for it may be as free from a groſs Corruption as from a leſſer.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Mr. Baxters *great Argument againſt* Nonconforming Diſſenters, *by which he makes them worſe than Papiſts, exploded by the Church of* England *as unſound.*

§. I. Mr *Baxter* in his poſtſcript to Dr. *Owen.* p. 3. doth aver, 'that the Nonconforming Diſſenters renounce Communion with the whole Church on Earth 'for 1200 or 1300 years, and with almoſt all Proteſtants 'as well as others. Now, whereas the Pope was taken 'to be intolerably arrogant when he excommunicated, 'or interdicted, but *Rarely* a whole Kingdom, or one King, 'but not all the Church on Earth. That the *Pope* and his '*Prelates* excommunicate the *Greeks*, and ſuch they call but '*Schiſmaticks*, and not Hereticks, with acceptions that they 'may be ſaved Chriſtians. But *theſe*, that I *confute*, *charging* '*the whole Church for* 1200 *years with Idolatry, or falſe Wor*'*ſhip, do thereby call all men to come out from among them, and* '*be ſeperate, and to hate them with that hatred that is due unto* '*Idolaters.*

§. II. In theſe words Mr. *Baxter* repreſents the preſent Lay Diſſenter, ſuch as Dr. *Owen*, to be worſe than Papiſts more cruel in their excommunications than the Pope or his Prelates, and that becauſe they, by aſſerting uninſtituted Worſhip to be falſe Worſhip or Idolatry, do make the whole Church for ſeveral hundred years Idolatrous, and not to be communicated with.

§. III. If there be any ſtrength in this of Mr. *Baxter* againſt the preſent Lay Diſſenter, 'tis of force alſo againſt all thoſe Proteſtants, who firſt brake off from Rome, for even then the Church, as for ſeveral hundred years before, was repreſented to be overthrown with deteſtable Idolatry

try, yea that very Idolatry, on which the first Reformer grounded their Seperation from *Rome*, was such as spread it self over the whole Church for many hundred years; so that their separation from the Church of *Rome* then, was on a *Reason common to the Church of Rome*, and the *whole Church* for several hundred years. Whence I conclude that if the Dissenters separation be so much worse than Popery, because they separate from the Church of *England* on a reason common with her and the whole Church for several hundred years; then if the first Reformers separated from *Rome* on a like reason common with that Church, and that the whole Church for several hundred years, the first Reformers must be also worse than Papists.

§. That the whole Church was for several hundred years overrun with detestable Idolatry, as well as at that time the first Reformers left Rome, is manifest from what I find in one of the *Homilies* by Law established, the Rehearsal whereof will be a sufficient Testimony that Mr. *Baxter* who suggests the contrary, has abandoned the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, whilst he is pleading for her Ceremonies.

§. V. In the Book of *Homilies*, of the peril of Idolatry, part. 3. 'tis affirmed 'That Laity and Clergy, learned, and 'Unlearned, all Ages, Sects and Degrees of Men, Women 'and Children of whole Christendome (an horrible and 'most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable Idolatry, of all other Vices most detestible of God, and most damnable to man, and that by 'the space of eight hundred years and more. So far the Homilie.

§. VI. This I count is enough to shew what little cause Mr. *Baxter* or any of his Admirers have to triumph over Dr. *Owens* twelve Arguments, which will abide in their strength

ſtrength ſo long as the Papiſts abide unable to reſiſt the Powerful Arguments drawn from Scripture againſt them: For the Principal Arguments urged by Dr. *Owen* againſt uninſtituted Worſhip and Ceremonies are the ſame by which the firſt Reformers have with great ſucceſs battered down the ſtrength of Rome, and Mr. *Baxter* in his Reply has but furbiſhed up the ruſty diſtinctions which he found amongſt the Rubbiſh of Popiſh Writings, for which Reaſon I may ſafely conclude that how Lawful ſoever Lay-Conformity may be on the Principles of the Church of *England*, yet it is very dangerous to conform on the Popiſh grounds, on which Mr. *Baxter* goes in writing for it.

§. VII. I'le not aggravate Mr. *Baxter's* ſlips, but ſeeing he and his Followers talke ſo much of the Diſſenters gratifiing the Papiſts, I'le only beſeech Mr. *Baxter* and his Party to conſider, whether the Diſſenters who ſuit their practice to old Proteſtant principles, or Mr. *Baxter* who eſpouſeth old rotten Popiſh Diſtinctions in defence of his practice be moſt likely to gratifie the Papiſts? And ſo

Farewel.

FINIS.